

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-9 currently remain in the application. Claim 3 is herein amended.

Regarding the matter of drawings in Paragraph 1 of the Official Letter, the examiner is hereby requested to note that numerals 33, for example in Fig. 5, indicate wheels as being parts of the running unit 30. It is therefore believed that no correction of drawings is necessary in order to properly support the claims section.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 in Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter. The Examiner's referral to claim 2 in Paragraphs 3-5, however, is believed to be erroneous, having been rather intended to be referred only to claim 3, because the recital "a power supply is disposed below the center of turning of the running unit of the outer frame" appears only in claim 3, not in claim 2. It is therefore only claim 3 that is herein amended regarding the running unit. Since the running unit is already described in claim 1 as being mounted on the sticking unit and fitted in the inner frame turnable in the outer frame, it is believed that the running unit in claim 3 is already known to have a center of turning and hence it should be deemed proper to use expression "the center of turning of the outer frame" because every turning motion has a center associated with it. In order to expedite the prosecution, however, the phrasing of claim 3 is herein amended. This is believed to obviate the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 4-8 were said, in Paragraph 10 of the Official Letter, to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since applicant believes that independent claim 1 and all of the intervening claims (after the amendment made herein) are to be allowed, as will be discussed hereinbelow, applicant opts at this time to decline the Examiner's suggestion to rewrite them in independent form.

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Narajowski. Rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. 102 is justified only when each of the inventive elements in that claim is disclosed in one reference. Narajowski does not clearly disclose every inventive element of independent claim 1, and hence it is believed that the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent therefrom is not justified and hence should be reversed.

Explained more in detail, Narajowski is not disclosing any structure anticipating the

present invention. Narajowski disclosed wheels at 55 and 56 in Fig. 7, having a fixed orientation, not intended to like the wiping unit as the latter rotates.

Narajowski discloses an embodiment comprising four wheel assemblies 25 (column 3, lines 67-68). These wheel assemblies 25 (Figs. 1 and 2) are each not a running unit. Each of these four sets may individually rotate but they are not intended to serve to cause the running unit to rotate. Instead, Narajowski's wheel assemblies are follower wheels for supporting the magnetic core 18 and maintaining a distance between the two carrier members 10 and 11 sandwiching the window pane W. In summary, Narajowski's wheels and the wheels according to the present invention have different roles, are differently structured, and function differently.

Thus, Narajowski is not disclosing any running unit which is freely rotatable with respect to the outer frame, which characterizes the present invention, and hence is believed not be predicate the Examiner's rejection.

In summary, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
/kn/

Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

November 10, 2010
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920